Literature and Psychology

The News Letter of the Conference on Literature and Psychology of the Modern Language Association

Issued quarterly during the months of February, May, August, and November

Editorial Address:
Dept. of English, The City College of New York
New York 31, New York

Leonard F. Manheim, *Editor*
Eleanor B. Manheim, *Associate*

Lore C. Kraus, Editorial Assistant

Officers for the 1957 Meeting

Frederick J. Hoffman, University of Wisconsin, Chairman

Leonard F. Manheim, City College of New York, Secretary

Editorial and Steering Committee

Wayne Burns, University of Washington

Helmut E. Gerber, Purdue University

Simon O. Lesser, Institute for Motivational Research

Vol. VII August, 1957 No. 3

Parricide is, according to a well-known conception, the chief and primitive crime of humanity as well as of the individual. It is in any case the main source of the sense of guilt; we do not know if it is the only one. Researches have not yet established the psychic origin of guilt and the need for expiation. But it is not necessary for it to be the only one. The psychological position is complicated and requires explanation. The relation of the boy to the father is, as we say, an "ambivalent" one (that is, composed of conflicting feelings of tenderness and hostility). In addition to the hate which wants to remove the father as a rival, a measure of tenderness for him also exists as a rule. Both attitudes of mind combine to produce identification with the father: the boy wants to be in his father's place because he admires him and wants to be like him, and also because he wishes to put him out of his way. This evolution now comes up against a serious obstacle. At a certain moment the child comes to understand that the attempt to remove the father as a rival would be punished by the father with castration. From fear of castration, that is, in the interests of preserving his virility, arises also a wish to possess his mother and to remove the father. So far as this wish remains in the unconscious, it forms the basis of the sense of guilt. We have, it is true, to make an important amplification in the normal fate of the so-called Oedipus complex.

—Sigmund Freud
Dostoevsky and Parricide

IN THIS ISSUE

Tentative Agenda of the Seventh Annual Conference on Literature and Psychology . . 32

Announcements and Comments 32

Conferences of interest at the September MLA Meeting, announcement of a new journal, books received and announced for publication.

"Oedipus in Nottinghamshire" by Daniel Weiss. 33

This year's Conference paper, a study of the parallels and divergences between the apparent and latent Oedipal material in D. H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers, is the work of a member of the English Department at the University of Washington at Seattle. Dr. Weiss holds his doctorate from Northwestern and taught at The City College of New York before emigrating to Washington. He plans to extend his study of D. H. Lawrence to include the later novels and short stories.

Professor Harry T. Moore, recent Lawrence biographer, having read Dr. Weiss's paper before publication, has this to say about it:

"My. . .comments will be almost entirely in the way of agreement. I think this is a really luminous reading of the text: you can see the people in the book more clearly, more brightly, than anyone else has seen them before you. . . . I think you're essentially right in seeing Miriam as the extension of the mother-relationship—and seeing the Cybele side of Clara was very good too. . . ."

Book Review. 42

The Editor reviews Art and Psychoanalysis, a symposium edited by William Phillips.

Bibliography (XXVII) 44

Books recently published, contributions from readers, and articles from periodicals received.

Tentative Agenda of the

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON LITERATURE AND PSYCHOLOGY

To be held at the Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, on Tuesday, September 10, 1957, from 2 to 3:30 p. m., in the room designated as Union Top Flight on the campus of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

1. Continuance of Organization

Questions: Shall we continue the meetings of a group to discuss the inter-relationships between literature and psychology, in the form of an annual Conference or, alternatively, as a Discussion Group, if the latter is approved by the officers and Program Committee of MLA? Shall the Steering Committee to be elected be authorized to negotiate, if necessary, for the inclusion of the discussions on literature and psychology on the agenda of any existing Discussion Group?

2. Permanent Organization

Nominating Committee: If it is the wish of those present, the Chairman will entertain a motion for the appointment of a Nominating Committee from those in attendance, to present a ticket for Chairman, Secretary, Editor, Associate Editor, and Editorial and Steering Committee for 1958, for election by those in attendance at the close of the meeting.

3. Conference Paper

"Oedipus in Nottinghamshire"

Presentation by Dr. Daniel Weiss, based on the paper pre-printed in Vol. VII, No. 3, of LITERATURE AND PSYCHOLOGY.

4. Discussion

Discussion from the floor based (1) on Dr. Weiss's paper, (2) on contents of recent issues of LITERATURE AND PSYCHOLOGY, and (3) on general topics, in the order named. Each speaker will be limited to four or five minutes in all. Members who cannot attend may submit brief statements in writing, which will be read or summarized by the Secretary.

5. Recommendations

Shall the publication of LITERATURE AND PSYCHOLOGY be continued under the auspices of the Conference or Discussion Group? Are there any suggestions for its future form, content or financing? Shall there be a specific topic for the next annual meeting, if any?

6. The Election

Slate to be presented by the Nominating Committee, if No. 2 above is approved, or by nominations from the floor.

OFFICERS FOR THE 1957 MEETING
Chairman: Frederick J. Hoffman
Secretary-Editor: Leonard F. Manheim
Associate Editor: Eleanor B. Manheim
Editorial and Steering Committee:
Wayne Burns Helmut Gerber Simon Lesser

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS

** We repeat the announcement in the last issue of two interesting Conferences, both of which are scheduled to be held at the same time: to wit, Monday, September 9, from 2 to 3:30 p. m.:

Conference 4: The New [illegible]alists. Leader, Helmut E. Gerber, Purdue University. [Union Twelfth Night]

Conference 5: Reading Poetry with Comprehension: The Role of Biographical Material. Leader, Harold E. Briggs, University of Southern California. [Education 109]

** The American Council of Learned Societies announces a program of fellowship grants, not to excees $7000 each, for tenure during the academic year 1958-1959, and a program of grants-in-aid for the same period, not to exceed $3000 each, both to aid humanistic research in fields including languages, literature, linguistics, and related projects in the social sciences which have a humanistic emphasis. In addition, special awards in the sum of $10,000 for the same year will be granted only on nomination from academic institutions, professional societies, and other sources. For applications for the first two types of aid, address ACLS Fellowship Program, 2101 R Street, Washington 8, D. C.

** Dr. H. L. Ansbacher announces that The Journal of Individual Psychology, published by the American Society of Adlerian Psychology, and formerly known as The American Journal of Individual Psychology, has broadened its editorial policy so that it may become "the medium of expression of those in psychology and related fields who are interested in a holistic, teleological, phenomenological, and socially oriented approach, based on the assumptions of an active creative self, an open system of motivation, and an innate potentiality for social living." Contributions should be sent to the Editor, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

** The following book has been received for review and is reviewed at p. 43 of the present issue:

William Phillips, editor — Art and Psychoanalysis (New York, Criterion Books, $8.50). 552+xxiv pp.

** Announced for publication this fall:

Ernest Jones — The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud (Volume Three, The Last Phase, covering the years from 1919 to 1939). (New York, Basic Books, Inc.)

Simon O. Lesser — Fiction and the Unconscious (Preface by Ernest Jones). (Boston, Beacon Press, Inc.)

In suggesting that Sons and Lovers /1 is provocative of psychoanalytic investigation, over and beyond the psychoanalytic background which the author himself provided, I realize that I am proposing a paradox. Interpretation asks a mystery, and here there seems to be no mystery that the artist has not anticipated. But beneath Lawrence's conscious recognition and manifest working out of his Oedipal theme, psychoanalytic study reveals a latent, nocturnal reworking of the same theme, as if, as is so often true, the artist's unconscious had outrun his intention in a race to the same goal. In Sons and Lovers the artistic recognition of the material becomes itself a false recognition, a feint to catch the artist's eye while the real leger de main of symbolic transformation does its work below the surface. In this subsurface we find unconscious material whose pertinence extends beyond the novel to include the remainder of the author's literary life—material from which spring the taut and devious relationships which distinguish Lawrence's protagonists. Sons and Lovers is a coin whose reverse is the remainder of Lawrence's works. It contains as latencies those unborn attitudes to which the Lawrence who created Paul Morel seems a stranger.

Mark Schorer's essay "Technique as Discovery" /2 outlines "discrepancies" in Sons and Lovers which "reveal certain confusions between intention and performance." These alleged discrepancies are twofold: Lawrence failed to resolve his ambivalent feelings toward his parents; he failed to come to artistic terms with the triad of women, Gertrude Morel, Miriam, and Clara. Of the second "failure" Schorer writes:

> The novel has two themes: the crippling effects of a mother's love on the emotional development of her son; and the split between kinds of love, physical and spiritual, which the son develops, the kinds represented by the two young women, Clara and Miriam. The two themes should of course work together, the second being actually the result of the first: this 'split' is the 'crippling.' So one would expect to see the novel developed, and so Lawrence, in his famous letter to Edward Garnett where he says that Paul is left at the end with the 'drift toward death,' apparently thought he had developed it. Yet in the last few sentences of the novel, Paul rejects his desire for extinction and turns toward. . .life—as nothing in his previous history persuades us that he could unfalteringly do.

The discrepancies Mark Schorer cites here cannot be explained away by any mechanical formulation of the process by which Paul Morel comes to the crossroads of his life. Lawrence himself offered such a formulation, summing up the intentional course of the novel in a sermonizing, portentous foreword, designed not so much for publication as to satisfy his own inner necessity. Lawrence devotes one of his usual paragraphs to glorifying sexual union in quasi-Biblical language and concludes as follows:

> But the man who is the go-between from Woman to production is the lover of that woman. And if that woman be his mother, then he is her lover in part only; he carries for her, but he is never received into her for his confirmation, and renewal, and so wastes himself away in the flesh. The old son-lover was Oedipus. The name of the new one is legion. And if the son-lover takes a wife, then she is not his wife, she is only his bed. And his life will be torn in twain, and his wife in her despair shall hope for sons, that she may have her lover in her hour. /3

The solution lies in ignoring such formulations as Lawrence has offered, and in focussing attention not on what Schorer calls "the self-righteous, aggressive, demanding mother" or the "simple, direct, gentle, downright fumbling ruined father," but upon the son and artist, whose role is not that of the passive victim of these parental powers, but the very opposite—the only begetter of a wish-begotten drama in which he is the ultimate victor.

This paper is guided by the conviction that the Oedipal situation, as Freud described it, prevails in the novel. Moreover it prevails against Lawrence's attempts to direct it along enlightened lines; that is, as a drama in which the son does not obtain possession of the mother and does not seek his father's death. On the contrary, the novel contains, symbolically represented, a very real and physical rivalry between father and son for the same woman, and a very real defeat of the father; and, as a complement to the unresolved residue of guilt at defeating the father, an ensuing love for and identification of the son with the father. The two themes, involving the mother and the two other women, are not, as Mark Schorer contends, unrelated as cause and effect, but have a very real and essential role in the working out of the novel. And the end of the novel, Paul's choice of life over death, is a valid resolution of the ambivalences, the disruptive "psychological tension" which is the very substance of the novel.

In both Schorer's criticism and Lawrence's foreword there is a fundamental assumption the acceptance of which obscures the essential action of the novel. What Lawrence does not take into account (nor does his critic) is that the Oedipal situation is initiated by the son as his earliest attempt to establish himself in the family constellation. Lawrence's instinctive reflex both in the novel and in his explanations of it has been to shift the burden of guilt wholly onto the shoulders of the parents. He has held the mirror up to nature and received an image reversed. As Jung says in his discussion of the incest barrier,

> Therefore pain and anger relate to the mother, as if she were responsible for the domestication of the sons of men. In order not to become conscious of his incest wish (his backward harking to the animal nature), the son throws all the burden of guilt on the mother, from which arises the idea of the "terrible mother." The mother becomes for him a spectre of anxiety, a nightmare. /4

1/ D. H. Lawrence, Sons and Lovers, New York, Harper Bros., 1951

2/ Mark Schorer, Hudson Review, I (Spring, 1948), pp. 67-87

3/ Aldous Huxley, edr., The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, London, Wm. Heinemann, 1932, p. 102

4/ C. G. Jung, The Psychology of the Unconscious, New York, Dodd Mead & Co., 1952, p. 267

Hamlet as it exists as a psychological *aperçu* in the critical canon, sets the unnatural crime of incest far above the natural crime of murder, as being the more serious of the two. And on psychological criminal calendars Hamlet is the offender rather than Claudius, who is, if not nice, at least mature. Just as Laertes shifts the blame with his "The king, the king's to blame," so the desperately involved author-protagonist of *Sons and Lovers* cries, "The king *and* the queen are both to blame!" both in his introduction and the consciously pursued action of the novel.

Walter

Without conjecturing upon the symbolic aptness of Gertrude Morel's christian name, I believe that the action of *Hamlet* bears importantly on an understanding of *Sons and Lovers*, for the latter exhibits remarkable parallels to the play.

The most remarkable of these parallels underlies Walter Morel's role as the defeated father, and his subsequent roles as rival and idealized father image. I should like, first of all, to suggest that Lawrence unconsciously rejected Walter Morel as Paul Morel's proper father, and Hamlet-like, accepted him only as a despised step-father. Certain internal evidence points to this. E. T. (Jessie Chambers), in her memoir of Lawrence, describes Lawrence's early draft of *Sons and Lovers*, in which she was somewhat disappointed:

> I could not help feeling that his treatment of the theme was far behind the reality in vividness and dramatic strength. Now and again he seemed to strike a curious, half-apologetic note bordering on the sentimental. . . . A non-conformist minister, whose sermons the mother helped to compose, was the *foil* to *the brutal husband*. /5 [Underlining mine]

Here the phantasy of the idealized father has developed, as fortunately it has not in the novel. In *Sons and Lovers* the "nonconformist minister" shrinks to a reminiscence of John Field, the "son of a well-to-do tradesman," who "had been to college in London," and wanted to devote himself to the ministry. Circumstances separate them, and Gertrude meets and marries Walter Morel. Hyperion, as in *Hamlet*, has been buried and the satyr rules in his place. The way lies open, as Ernest Jones suggests, for the son to renounce his filial obligations of love and respect to someone who is merely a step-father.

> In Hamlet the two contrasting elements of the normal ambivalent attitude towards the father were expressed towards the father substitutes, Claudius and Polonius. In other words, the original father has been transformed into two fathers, one good and the other bad, corresponding with the division in the son's feelings. With Caesar, on the other hand, the situation is simpler. He is still the original father, both loved and hated at once, even by his murderer. /6

Freud offers a basis for such a phantasy in his essay, "Family Romances." Originally, he says, a child wishes to be free from the authority of both parents equally. To realize this wish he rejects in phantasy his real parents in favor of idealized dream parents, the kings and queens of the fairy tales. Later the phantasy is forced to a further modification. When the child discovers the true nature of the sexual relationship and "realizes that *pater semper incertus est* while the mother is *certissima*, the family romance undergoes a peculiar curtailment; it contents itself with exalting the child's father but no longer casts any doubt on his maternal origin." /7

A second, more obviously parricidal phantasy, in which all rivals, both paternal and fraternal, are done away with, is mentioned and correctly described in Harry Thornton Moore's life of Lawrence.

> Lawrence Clark Powell in the Manuscripts of D. H. Lawrence says that, in what is probably the earliest surviving holograph of *Paul Morel* [the original title of *Sons and Lovers*] the 'father accidentally kills Paul's brother, is jailed, and dies upon his release.' Once again, as in the first novel [summarized by E. T.], Lawrence was conveniently getting the father out of the way. /8

In this situation the idealized unseen parent is overlooked, but the crime of murder relates the action to a Claudius-like father image.

Having conceived of an idealized father in the nonconformist minister of the first draft only to dismiss him, and having implicated the brutal father in a sordid murder in another version, Lawrence was then free to develop in Walter Morel the diapason of attributes which lay between these two, beginning with his role of enemy and rival, unworthy candidate for the hand of Paul Morel's mother.

The marriage of Walter Morel to Gertrude Beardsall is the marriage of a well-born lady to a miner, whose origins are dubious. "His grandfather was a French refugee who had married an English barmaid — if it had been a marriage." (p. 13) Here, to begin with, is the evolved family situation (to which actual events lend plausibility), in which the idealized father image has been read out of the work, and so is, in effect, dead; and one has only the base-born, inferior step-father to deal with, the "bloat king" Claudius of *Hamlet*.

But intellectual and social inferiority are only the first step in the degradation of Walter Morel as the brutal step-father. Just as for Hamlet sensuality and passion are personified in Claudius, and abhorred because, having identified his sexual objective with the king's, Hamlet feels guilty of a vicarious incest, so Lawrence's conception of Walter Morel gathers to itself a very special phallic imagery in which a little envy commingles with an immense disgust. The

5/ E. T. [Jessie Chambers], *D. H. Lawrence*, New York, Knight, 1936, p. 191

6/ Ernest Jones, *Hamlet and Oedipus*, New York, W. W. Norton, 1949, p. 122

7/ Sigmund Freud, "Family Romances," *Collected Papers*, London, Hogarth Press, 1950, Vol. V, p. 76. See also Otto Rank, *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero*, New York, Nerv. & Ment. Dis. Pub., 1914

8/ Harry T. Moore, *The Life and Works of D. H. Lawrence*, New York, Twayne, 1951, p. 95

great motif à rebours of Sons and Lovers is the celebration of virginity, a celebration that Lawrence performs in many ways. E. T. records that" Lawrence was loath to admit that boyhood was over. He was most reluctant to begin shaving, and was hurt when people chaffed him about the pale hairs on his chin." /9 In a novel where to de-flower is a crime, and the flower, to judge by the blossoms Lawrence scatters throughout the book, is preferred to the fruit, Walter Morel introduces the undesirable phallic note into the scene.

In the very beginning of the novel there occurs a significant pair of offerings, one from Walter Morel, the other from Gertrude's son William. One is accepted, the other rejected. From the "wakes," the country fair, to which Gertrude Morel is hostile, William brings her a pair of egg cups, decorated with moss roses. She accepts them. Later on Walter Morel returns, half drunk, and lays a coconut, "a hairy object," on the table. She does not thank him, merely shaking it to see if it has any milk, then," very tired, and sick of his babble, went to bed as quickly as possible, while he raked the fire." (p.10)

Even in his vocation Walter Morel the miner is a creature of the underworld, the darkness. He compares himself to the "moudiwarp," the mole, a burrower in the earth. The imagery that envelops him is fleshy, red, moist, warm, nocturnal. In his first description of Walter, Lawrence deals kindly with him.

> . . .a certain subtle exultation like glamour in his movements, and his face the flower of his body, ruddy with dark, tumbled hair, and laughing alike whatever partner he bowed before. . . . Therefore the dusky, golden softness of this man's sensuous flame of life that flowed from his flesh like the flame from a candle, not baffled and gripped into incandescence by thought and spirit as her [Gertrude's] life was, seemed to her something wonderful, beyond her. (pp. 14,15)

This is Walter Morel, to pursue the phallic motif, tumescent, at a time anterior to Paul's birth, when the artist, describing the courtship between his parents, could afford to describe the idealized father, the nocturnal ruddy dancer. The successive incidents describe what may be called a progressive detumescence, a process accomplished, significantly enough, with the birth of Paul.

At first Morel is effective as the destroyer of flowers. William is his first victim, when Morel cuts off his curls. The act is typical; on the surface an initiation into manhood of the son by the father, its effect, latent in the dream interpretation of haircutting, is symbolic castration.

> . . .the child, cropped like a sheep, with such an odd, round poll — looked wondering at her; and on a newspaper spread out upon the hearthrug, a myriad of crescent shaped curls, like the petals of a marigold scattered in the reddening firelight . . . . This act of masculine clumsiness was the spear through the side of her love for Morel. (pp. 20, 21)

To the infantile observer, says Freud in his Interpretation of Dreams, sexual intercourse between parents appears to be "an act of violence and a fight." In Sons and Lovers, while the brief period of happiness between Walter Morel and Gertrude is unconvincingly touched upon, by far the most vivid descriptions of their relationship are those of Walter's acts of violence against Gertrude. It is true that they take place in the lamplight of the kitchen, but the scenes are enveloped in a language that is full of the excessive loathing which is the attitude of the virginal adolescent toward his father, the disgust of the brothers Karamazov for old Karamazov.

It follows that the result of these "acts of violence" should be, from the son's point of view, in the phantasy of rivalry, the rejection of the father in favor of the son. Because it is to the son's advantage for the mother to remain virginal, saving herself for the son, Gertrude Morel, in these scenes insulates herself in an imagery whose common property is purity. Walter, in contrast, is swollen with blood.

> He came up to her, his red face, with its bloodshot eyes, thrust forward, and gripped her arms. She cried in fear of him, struggling to be free. Coming slightly to himself, panting, he pushed her roughly to the outer door, and thrust her forth, slotting the bolt behind her with a bang. Then he went back to the kitchen, dropped into his armchair, his head bursting, full of blood, sinking between his knees.
>
> The moon was high and magnificent in the August night. Mrs. Morel. . . became aware of something about her. With an effort she roused herself to see what it was that penetrated her consciousness. The tall, white lilies were reeling in the raw moonlight and the air was charged with their perfume, as with a presence. (pp. 29, 30)

She is then pregnant with Paul. E. T. recalls that Mrs. Lawrence told her that Lawrence hated his father. "I know why he hates his father. It happened before he was born. One night he put me out of the house. . . . He's bound to hate his father." /10

After each one of these violent scenes, Morel, defeated by Gertrude's purity, shrinks, detumesces. " Physically, even, he shrank, and his fine, full presence waned. He never grew in the least stout, so that, as he sank from his erect, assertive bearing, his physique seemed to contract along with his pride and moral strength." (p. 34)

The last violent scene between Paul Morel's parents culminates in a ceremony of blood, closing the circle around the son and his mother. Morel, in a rage, flings a drawer at Gertrude. It strikes her across the brow, wounding her. She retains consciousness, still holding the infant Paul in her arms. Morel is appalled at what he has done.

> As he looked at her, who was cold and impassive as stone, with mouth tight shut, he sickened with feebleness and hopelessness of spirit. He was turning away drearily, when he saw a drop of blood fall from the averted wound into the baby's fragile, glistening

9/E. T., op. cit., p. 43

10/E. T., op. cit., p. 138

> hair. Fascinated, he watched the heavy, dark drop hang in the glistening cloud, and pull down the gossamer. Another drop fell. It would seep through into the baby's scalp. He watched, fascinated, feeling it soak in; then, finally, his manhood broke. (p. 34)

In its context as the unconscious sexual symbolism of the artist, the blood following the act of violence is menstrual blood, and as such, betokens a renewal of the mother's purity, free of the bondage placed upon her by the father's seed. It is this deeper symbolism that gives real ambience to the more consciously achieved affect of the mystic communion between Gertrude and Paul when her blood falls upon his head. Last of all it justifies itself artistically as a prophetic pantomime, a tragic irony. The blood of the mother is not on the father's head, but upon the son's.

Morel's phallic disintegration continues, under the critical eye of his virginal rival. "There came over him [Morel] a look of meanness and paltriness. . . . Moreover Morel's manners got worse and worse, his habits somewhat disgusting." (p. 136) And while Morel's dissolution continues, the contrapuntal theme of Gertrude's purity and fairy-tale nobility mounts in intensity. She is described as "queenly." She receives tribute from her sons "like a queen."

> Mrs. Morel was one of those naturally exquisite people who can walk in mud without dirtying their shoes. But Paul had to clean them for her. . . and he cleaned them with as much reverence as if they had been flowers. (p. 146)

Out of this hyperbole, the queenliness of Gertrude, the bestiality of Walter, the devotion of the son, all of which represents the conscious rendering of the Oedipal theme, comes the final playing out of Walter Morel's role in the novel. And it is to Shakespeare again that one must turn for an analagous action.

Like Claudius, Morel guesses at the relationship between Gertrude and Paul. He walks in at a moment when Paul kisses her. "'At your mischief again?' he said venomously." Angered, he throws Paul's supper into the fire. Paul leaps up to fight with him. They are about to come to blows when behind them they hear Gertrude moan in a faint. It is like the queen, slipping away in the midst of Hamlet's three-cornered duel. When she comes to herself again, Paul, like Hamlet in the closet-scene, has only one concern.

> "Sleep with Annie, Mother, not with him."
> "No, I'll sleep in my own bed."
> "Don't sleep with him, mother."
> "I'll sleep in my own bed." (p. 253)

Walter's recognition of the relationship between Paul and Gertrude accomplishes his destruction and more. He makes a continuation of the classical Oedipal theme on a manifest level impossible for the artist. Lawrence seems to have been acutely aware of the dilemma he created for himself. The strain begins to tell in the scene described above. The communion between the son and the mother becomes suddenly too intense.

> He had taken off his collar and tie, and rose, bare-throated, to go to bed. As he stooped to kiss his mother, she threw her arms around his neck, hid her face on his shoulder and cried, in a whimpering voice, so unlike her own that he writhed in agony. (p. 251)

My concern here is not for Gertrude, but for the father, whose awareness of the secret makes his presence intolerable. It is my own belief that Lawrence suffered keenly for his exposure of the material touched upon in this passage, and that the passing of Morel from the novel as the effective father is the natural sequel to this exposure. Ernest Jones points out that "the complete expression of the 'repressed' wish . . . not only that the father should die, but that the son should then espouse the mother" is a "painful idea." /11 And it is the mother in both cases—in Hamlet because of the "infidelity" of Gertrude with Claudius, in Sons and Lovers because of the nature of Gertrude's relationship with Paul——who brings to light the repressed material. Of Hamlet's mother Jones says, "Her behaviour has stirred things in him that he cannot endure and which may make his life or his sanity impossible." /12

Baxter

It is significant that the chapters following this naked exploration of leitmotif are those which deal for the first time with Paul's sexual experiences with Clara and Miriam, and his conflict with Clara's husband. What has happened? The artist is still heavy with the obligation to pursue and resolve the Oedipal theme, in spite of its sudden transformation into an enormity. His strategy is traditional. He shifts the parental image from its bases in reality to the field of symbolic action. They become other people—in this case the "lovers." The "absence of family tie," as Jones explains Hamlet's almost casual murder of Polonius, releases Paul Morel from the narrow confines of a recognizable and dangerous relationship, allowing him to investigate, in symbolically transformed terms, those areas the "family tie" had made inaccessible.

With the sentence that concludes the scene last described, "His last fight was fought in that home," the potency slips from Walter Morel in his role as rival, and transfers itself to Baxter Dawes, who is in Sons and Lovers a vitally important clue to the future development of the Lawrence protagonist. The superficial resemblance to Walter Morel can be dismissed in a few sentences. In physical appearance Baxter belongs to Morel's order of being, "white skin, with a clear, golden tinge, "as against Morel with his ruddy cheeks and moist, red mouth. He is also the rejected husband of a superior, sensitive woman. He works with his hands, a blacksmith, while his wife has educated herself beyond him. He becomes involved with Paul in a deadly rivalry for the same woman.

The most revealing evidence that Walter Morel's paternal identity has been transferred to Baxter Dawes lies in the ambivalence of Paul's attitude toward him. This is the characteristic ambivalent feeling of the son for the father: hatred combined with a measure of tenderness, out of which comes a sense of identification with the father. The son's relinquishment of the wish to possess

11/Ernest Jones, op. cit., p. 79
12/Ibid., p. 93

the mother, partly motivated by the so-called "castration fear," serves at once to form the basis of a sense of guilt and "to deflect in the direction of femininity, to put himself instead in his mother's place and take over her role as object of his father's love." /13 But this alternative is found to be equally impossible, and so both hatred and love of the father undergo repression.

The "tenderness," the compassion that tempers hatred, the "morbid solicitude," and the inclination to deflect in the direction of femininity are constants in the personality of the Lawrence protagonist. They are at their purest in Sons and Lovers, because they are unconsciously rendered. There is no raisonneur, no Birkin of Women in Love, or Lilly of Aaron's Rod to justify the ways of a man with a man. Moreover, the line of descent from father to rival to friend, is clearly traceable in the affinities between Walter Morel and Baxter Dawes.

Paul's preparation for his meeting with Dawes begins early, with the ambivalence in his feeling for his father.

> "Make him stop drinking," he prayed every night.
> "Lord, let my father die," he prayed very often.
> "Let him not be killed at pit," he prayed, when after tea his father did not come home from work. (p. 74)

In the remissions from hatred of Walter Morel, Lawrence describes the compassion of Paul for his father, and even the pleasure Paul takes in his father's masculinity, as it expresses itself in his handiwork about the house, and his life in the pits. But always the compassion is combined with a sense of separation and fear, and later on, as Paul grows older, a tolerant, motherly, and wifely contempt for his father's crotchets, as Gertrude describes them to him.

> So she talked to her son, almost as if she were thinking aloud to him, and he took it in as best he could, by sharing her trouble to lighten it. And in the end she shared almost everything with him without knowing. (p. 105)

E. T. recalls,

> . . . I heard him tell mother, in a voice that was clearly an unconscious imitation of his mother's, how Ernest and his fiancee had spent a fortnight's holiday with them, and that it had proved something of a strain. /14

It is Clara Dawes and Baxter Dawes who form the new parental constellation in the novel, the foster parents, devoid of "family tie," with whom Paul will act out the repressions that obscure his relations with Walter and Gertrude. It is his interest in Clara that quickens his interest in Dawes, and his interest in her is heightened by his curiosity about her marriage to Dawes and her subsequent "revulsions" toward him. Following Paul's frustrated attempts to come to terms with Miriam, he fixes upon Clara. It is through her that he first satisfies his curiosity about Dawes. His interrogation of her is significant. As the interrogator Paul seems to be working out a new and more feasible solution than the one awaiting him at home. He asks questions about a rival about whom he has foreknowledge:

> "You went to sleep as you grew to be a woman? How queer! And he didn't wake you?"
> "No; he never got there," she replied in a monotone.
> The brown birds dashed over the hedges where the rose-hips stood naked and scarlet.
> "Got where?" he asked.
> "At me. He never really mattered to me." (p. 322)

Everything, even the floral commentary, the sudden flurry of brown birds among the naked, scarlet rose-hips, is a reflection of Paul's prophetic soul, and his triumph over the older man.

But after this triumph comes again the sense of guilt, and with it the "morbid solicitude" which Jones describes. /15 Paul becomes the devil's advocate. Clara describes Baxter's brutality, and Paul defends him.

> "But did you—were you ever—did you ever give him a chance?
> "Chance? How?"
> "To come near you."
> "I married him—and I was willing."—They both strove to keep their voices steady.
> "I believe he loves you," he said.
> "It looks like it," she replied. (p. 322)

The thrusting of Baxter upon an unwilling Clara is a reflection, in spite of his very real physical attraction toward her, of Paul's unwillingness to pursue what must appear, latent in Lawrence's handling of the subject, as an unnatural offense against the older man. The triumph implicit in Dawes' "never getting there," and the noblesse-oblige toward a rival too much like one's self, act as spur and rein, and frustrate Paul.

> He was like so many young men of his own age. Sex had become so complicated in him that he would have denied that he ever could want Clara or Miriam or any woman whom he knew. Sex desire was a sort of detached thing, that did not belong to a woman. (p. 323)

In every encounter with Dawes Paul's ambivalence reveals itself.

> Paul and he were confirmed enemies, and yet there was between them that peculiar feeling of intimacy, as if they were secretly near to each other, which sometimes exists between two people although they never speak to each other. Paul often thought of Baxter Dawes, often wanted to get at him [underlining mine] and be friends with him. He knew that Dawes often thought about him, and the man was drawn to him by some bond or other. And yet the two never looked at each other save in hostility. (p. 401)

The same tenderness pervades a scene of open conflict with Dawes. The older man insults

13/Sigmund Freud, "Dostoevsky and Parricide," Collected Papers, Vol. V, pp. 222-242, on which, as well as on Ernest Jones, op. cit., the theoretical material in this and the following paragraphs is based.

14/E. T., op. cit., p. 26

15/Ernest Jones, op. cit., p. 79

Paul, who dashes a glass of wine in his face.

> He hated Dawes, wished something would exterminate him at that minute; and at the same time, seeing the wet hair on the man's forehead, he thought that he looked pathetic. He did not move. . . Paul had a curious sensation of pity, almost of affection mingled with violent hate for the man. (p. 403)

And when Paul tells Clara about the incident and she is furious with Dawes, Paul defends him to her.

> "Yet you married him," he said. . . .
> "I did," she cried, "but how was I to know?"
> "I think he might have been rather nice," he said. (p. 405)

This Christ-like forbearance is suspect; it is not the "detached criticism" of the cool intellect that Lawrence says it is. The "thrusting forward" of Dawes' "handsome, furious face" is a reminder of the thrusting forward of another furious face that simultaneously demanded and denied his love. The ego, which Freud describes as "offering itself as a victim to fate," demands a passivity from Paul, and even a desire to be a victim. When Clara urges him to protect himself from Baxter, he refuses to take any defensive measures. To her "And if he kills you?" his reply is "I should be sorry for his sake and mine."

Paul's opportunity to submit is offered him by Dawes, in their battle together. It is a test of Paul, and his behavior in the fight, and its outcome, gather together both the unconscious conflicts and their symbolic realization to a point of fusion. All of Lawrence's physical struggles between men are the wrestling of Jacob with the angel at the ford, ending in apocalyptic revelation. With Dawes' life in his hands Paul recognizes his adversary, and the nature of his crime. Even in describing the struggle the language ventures beyond violence.

> He lay pressed hard against his adversary, his body adjusting itself to its one purpose of choking the other man, resisting exactly at the right moment, with exactly the right amount of strength, the struggles of the other, silent, intent, unchanging, gradually pressing its knuckles deeper, feeling the struggles of the other body become wilder, and more frenzied. . . . Then suddenly he relaxed, full of wonder and misgiving. (p. 429)

At the last Paul offers himself "as a victim to fate." Dawes, released, kicks him into unconsciousness and leaves him.

In the outcome of the fight, with Paul, the other man's life in his hands, relenting, finally defeated at Dawes' hands, Lawrence has defined the interior conflict in his protagonist's mind. Like David (a favorite of Lawrence's), who spares Saul's life but cuts off the hem of his garment, Paul commits just the right degree of parricide, recoils, and offers himself in atonement for his crime.

His first thought, when he recovers consciousness, is to get back to his mother. "That was his blind intention." Gertrude Morel sits by his bedside, distraught. "There was something between them that neither cared to mention. Clara came to see him. Afterward he said to his mother: 'She makes me tired, Mother,'" It is the sense of having ventured too far, of being allowed to venture too far, in a relationship sanctioned by conventional society, and into a hostility that has no admixture of compassion, that drives Paul back upon his mother. Here, at least, the "something between them" need never be explored, and his conflict with his father, while actual enough, had ended without overt physical violence. The return to Gertrude is a return from the rigors of reality. The irony consists in his being driven back into the unspeakable Oedipal situation through his recognition of that situation in what should have been a more acceptable surrogate for it —the rivalry with an older man for the possession of his wife.

That Dawes' attack on Paul ultimately ends in his own defeat does not contradict the psychological truth of the action. Dawes is defeated by the same symptomatic "morbid solicitude" that characterizes Paul's attitude toward him. He goes to visit Dawes at the hospital.

> There was a feeling of connexion between the rival men, more than ever since they had fought. In a way Morel felt guilty toward the other, and more or less responsible. And being in such a state of soul himself, he felt an almost painful nearness to Dawes . . . . Besides, they had met in naked extremity of hate, and it was a bond. At any rate the elemental man in each had met. (p. 445)

Paul's return to his mother as a helpless, beaten child is his effective, but costly, unconscious solution of his problem. His helplessness is a regression to a childhood whose epicene (castrate) nature would allow him possession of his mother without further fear of his father. And in this regressive action is implicit his rejection of Clara. Unsexed, he no longer has need of her.

In his further gesture, the returning of Clara to Dawes, Paul extends the regressive nature of his act to include the closing of the parental arch over his head again,—— an arch which, in his own real family, is crumbling. He strives to commit the ultimate in self-abnegation, the martyrization, as Freud suggests, of the ego by the stern parental super-ego. In the process Dawes is elevated to the level of the idealized father.

> But Dawes now carried himself quietly, seemed to yield himself, while Paul seemed to screw himself up. Clara thought she had never seen him look so small and mean. He was as if trying to get himself into the smallest possible compass. . . . Watching him unknown she said to herself there was no stability in him. He was fine in his way, passionate, and able to give her drinks of pure life when he was in one mood. And now he looked paltry and insignificant. There was nothing stable about him. Her husband had more manly dignity. . . . And yet she watched him rather than Dawes, and it seemed as if their three fates lay in her hands. (p. 476)

Paul has now assumed the "paltry and insignificant" used to describe Walter Morel earlier in the book, and has placed Baxter Dawes beside Clara. But in exchange for these

sacrifices their "three fates lay in his hands." He has become, in this re-creation of the family, the idealized son, who through suffering and sacrifice has achieved knowledge and power, the attributes of messiahhood, an acceptance through expiation.

There is an unconscious causality between the fight with Dawes, the death of Paul's mother, and the return, after her death, of Clara to Dawes; a causality that finds its source in Paul's fight with his father. Earlier in the novel, as he and Walter glare at each other prepared to strike, Gertrude faints away. After the fight with Dawes, Gertrude "faints" again, but this time the disease is mortal. For Paul, whose vague, shifting burden of guilt could attach a ritual significance to his battle with Dawes, his open conflict with the man for his wife has brought about his mother's death. His mother dead, and his father reduced to ineffectuality, Paul's feelings of guilt and "responsibility" are displaced to Clara and Dawes. In giving her back to Dawes, he says in effect, "I took you from my father with disastrous results. Now I give you back to avoid making the same mistake." Dawes becomes the idealized father-image; Clara the assessor. And Paul's act of Christ-like renunciation and expiation is, like Dostoevsky's acceptance of the Little Father of Mother Russia, a repression of his hostility against his father, an acceptance, an idealization, and finally an identification. The rescue of Dawes from despondency, as Paul undertakes it, is in these terms the resolution of the impulse to be quits with the father, to return good for evil. As Freud puts it,

> The idea of 'rescue' actually has a signifiance and history of its own and is an independent derivative of the mother-complex, or more correctly, of the parental complex. When a child hears that he owes his life to his parents, the feelings of tenderness in him mingle with the longing to be big and independent himself, so that he forms the wish to repay the parents for this gift and requite it by one of like value. It is as though the boy said in defiance: 'I want nothing from father; I shall repay him all I have cost him.' He then weaves a phantasy of saving his father's life on some dangerous occasion by which he becomes quits with him. /16

Returning Clara to Dawes is also in the nature of a "rescue," the saving of Clara from a moral fall that Paul himself has brought about. In effect it is a restoration of the mother to her former purity; and with it the achievement of a state of rest, a truce that will persist through the rest of Lawrence's work, between himself and the father.

Gertrude

Gertrude Morel moves through Sons and Lovers like a cry of pain. Her truth is valid only as she is an expression of her son's anguish. And this both in spite of and because of the clinical verisimilitude with which Lawrence images her as the Jocasta par excellence. Of the other characters it can be said that Lawrence is truly their creator, since they live in obedience to their own laws. But of Gertrude Morel he is merely the undertaker, responsible for her careful embalming. Her likeness is a magnificent death mask. Around her cluster the metaphors of queenliness, and virginity, and youth, the mechanically collated evidence of the Oedipal relationship. Her son William was "like her knight who wore her favour in the battle." When she goes into town with Paul, they feel "the excitement of lovers having an adventure together."

> She was gay like a sweetheart. . . . As he saw her hands in their old black gloves getting the silver out of the worn purse, his heart contracted with pain of love for her. (p. 111)

The inevitable wish of the child that his mother remain young becomes the conscious theme of Paul's outbursts.

> "Why can't a man have a young mother? What is she old for? . . . And why wasn't I the oldest one? Look—they say the young ones have the advantage—but look, they had the young mother. You should have had me for your eldest son."
>
> "I didn't arrange it," she remonstrated. "Come to consider, you're as much to blame as me." He turned on her, white, his eyes furious. (p. 284)

Here the subtle disguise Paul's wish bears is the important thing. His real desire is to be even more than the "oldest son" is not even that his mother remain young, but that they be equal in age no matter what that age is.

It is as the mother of the infant Paul that Lawrence completely idealizes her as Rachel, the virginal mother:

> Mrs. Morel watched the sun wink from the glistening sky, leaving a soft, flower-blue overhead . . . . A few shocks of corn in a corner of the fallow stood up as if alive; she imagined them bowing; perhaps her son would be a Joseph. . . .
>
> In her arms lay the delicate baby. . . . She no longer loved her husband. She had not wanted this child to come, and there it lay in her arms and pulled at her heart. . . . She would make up for having brought it into the world unloved. She would love it all the more now it was here; carry it in her love. (pp. 45, 46)

Virginally, she soothes herself with "the scent of flowers;" she is Flora, never Ceres, long ago having chosen between her son's moss rose and Walter's unhappy, hairy coconut.

But the real necessity for this purity rests, not with Gertrude, but with Paul. It is his wish that she remain pure. Freud suggests that "the grown man's conscious mind likes to regard the mother as the personification of impeccable moral purity," out of an unconscious jealousy of the father, and a horror of adult sexuality. /17 And E. T., writing of Lawrence's disgust at hearing men, "commercial travellers" (unregenerate breed!), talking on a train, remembers feeling

that the whole question of sex had for

16/Sigmund Freud, "A Special Type of Object-Choice Met With in Psychoanalytic Work," Collected Papers, Vol. IV, 1946, p. 200

17/Ibid., p. 198

> him the fascination of horror, and also that in his repudiation of any possibility of a sex relation between us he felt that he paid me a deep and subtle compliment. /18

The obverse of the medal is the Lawrence who, despairing at the futility of the task of keeping the virginal image uncontaminated by sex, turns and rationalizes by his vehement declarations that "the sensual passions and mysteries are equally sacred with the spiritual mysteries and passions." /19

Yet through the mask of Lawrence's mother there emerge occasionally the living signs of the deathly relationship between Paul and Gertrude Morel. Her careful distinction between the mind and the body, made originally in her relations with William when she refuses to acknowledge his manhood and its needs, leads, in her life with Paul, to a love affair of the spirit. And with Paul she is freer to lead it, for it is with his complicity. When Paul's picture wins a prize at the Castle, Mrs. Morel cries, "Hurrah my boy! I knew we should do it!" almost as if it were a child they had borne between them.

Confronted with Paul's mistresses, she directs most of her bitterness against the one who most resembles herself, the sexually frigid Miriam, the one whom Paul likewise recognizes as his mother's rival. Her judgments of Miriam are true for both of them.

> "She is one of those who will want to suck a man's soul out till he has none of his own left," she said to herself; "and he is just such a gaby as to let himself be absorbed. She will never let him become a man; she never will." (p. 190)

Lawrence's attributing to Gertrude a preference for Clara rather than Miriam is the expression of a wish whose fulfillment would preserve the spiritual nexus in which Paul and Gertrude meet as lovers. The addition of Clara (who did not exist but had to be invented) to the relationship would provide a modus vivendi, for both mother and son. Gertrude is made to see this:

> Mrs. Morel considered. She would have been glad now for her son to fall in love with some woman who would--she did not know what. But he fretted so, got so furious suddenly, and again was melancholic. She wished he knew some nice woman --- She did not know what she wished, but left it vague. (p. 285)

Clara represents the side of a relationship that neither she nor Miriam could provide. And both Gertrude and Miriam give Clara to him, in order to purge his spiritual nature of its fleshly dross and to have him back refined and virginal. But it is important to remember that it is Paul who is the unconscious seeker, and the one, ultimately, who realizes the need that Clara can satisfy in him. Mrs. Morel's compliance with the idea of Clara is the compliance of a woman putting her child out to wet-nurse. For Paul the sexuality she offers is feasible incest, just as his relationship with Miriam, although consummated sexually, is not, both relationships being determined by the root Oedipal relationship.

The death of Mrs. Morel has the tragic inevitability of Clytemnestra's murder or Jocasta's suicide. It is the sequel to revelation, which presents two equally horrid alternatives to the protagonist: either the conscious continuation of an unnatural relationship, or the cessation by death of any such possibility. I have suggested that the artist of Sons and Lovers brought his passional side of the affair with his mother to a halt when it threatened an become an enormity. Symptomatic of that enormity was the recognition by the father of the "mischief" Paul and his mother were up to, and the subsequent beginning of a real physical struggle between father and son. It is the mother's fainting---not her death this time, but only the simulacral prefiguring of her death-- that brings about Paul's search for an acceptable mother-substitute. The enfeebling of Gertrude puts her beyond desire as a sexual object, the girl who would race up a hill, and who had attracted Walter Morel. More and more there injects itself into the descriptions of Paul's love for his mother, fuller and deeper complexities of "terror, agony, and love."

> His life wanted to free itself of her. It was like a circle where life turned back on itself, and got no further. (p. 405)

It is at this point that he is sexually involved, for the first time with some success, with Clara, the younger rival in a new triangle. His open, terrible, revealing fight with Baxter Dawes is followed, as was his narrowly avoided fight with Walter Morel, by another failure in Gertrude's health, this time a fatal one.

For now the recognition, as Lawrence consciously indicates it, is complete. And his task, as before, is to render its consummation impossible. Now, in accordance with the old myth, following the parricide and the achieved marriage (with both Clara and Miriam), the mother must be destroyed.

> He and his mother seemed almost to avoid each other. There was some secret between them which they could not bear. He was not aware of it. He only knew that his life seemed unbalanced, as if it were going to smash to pieces. (p. 431)

Gertrude's cancer comes as a relief to this stalemate, like the diabolical fulfillment of an oracle. For at the heart of Paul's anguish lies an unconscious awareness of the secondary advantage to be gained from her death---she will be preserved to him. One of his great wishes has been that she remain young and uncorrupted, virginal. As the ender of life death is also the preserver of life, a bitter truism which suicides intuitively grasp, pinching their lives off to anticipate destruction. Gertrude, dying, gathers to herself the imagery of youth.

> He sat down by the bed, miserably. She had a way of curling and lying on her side, like a child. The grey and brown hair was loose over her ear.
> "Doesn't it tickle you?" he said, gently putting it back.

18/E. T., op. cit., p. 153

19/See C. N. Stavrou, "D. H. Lawrence's 'Psychology' of Sex," Lit. & Psy., VI, 3 (August, 1956), 92, citing Lawrence's foreword to Women in Love.

"It does," she replied.
His face was near hers. Her blue eyes smiled straight into his, like a girl's——warm, laughing with tender love. It made him pant with terror, agony, and love. (p. 451)

And with her death the transformation is complete. She becomes the fulfillment of his wish:

She lay like a maiden asleep. With his candle in his hand, he bent over her. She lay like a girl asleep and dreaming of her love . . . . She was young again . . . . She would wake up. She would lift her eyelids. She was with him still. (p. 467)

Paul's other great wish is that he himself may die. When Lawrence writes about Paul, his artistic ego, he continually offers himself, like Dostoevsky, "as a victim to fate." Gertrude's anguish is related to her thought of the "relief" it might have brought her if Paul had died as a baby, and similarly Paul's anguish and wish to die find their source in his open hostility and death-wish toward his father, and his repressed death—wish toward his mother when her love threatens his manhood.

Gertrude's death gives rise in Paul to a very dangerous line of thought, that in dying he will be with his mother, just as the minister had promised Gertrude that she will be with her son William.

Sometimes they looked into each other's eyes. Then they almost seemed to make an agreement. It was almost as if he were agreeing to die also. (p. 459)

Paul waters her milk to weaken her, and finally he administers an overdose of morphia to her. All as if he were sending her ahead to an assignation.

"What are you doing?" said Annie.
"I s'll put 'em in her night milk."
Then they both laughed like two conspiring children. On top of all their horror flickered this little sanity. (p. 461)

What gives the death of Gertrude its special intensity and importance——Paul's reaction to it is the point on which the novel resolves itself——is the unwritten confusion in the artist's mind. Gertrude's death is at once a real death and a sexual death. Never is she described with such amorous concern as when she is on her death-bed, dreaming her young dream. She is, for the first time in the novel, sexually desirable and seemingly available to the son. His only rival skulks below stairs and will not even look at her. Walter Morel is afraid of her. Only Paul is her lover.

They all stood back. He kneeled down and put his face to hers and his arms around her.
"My love—my love—oh, my love!" he whispered again and again. "My love—oh, my love!" (p. 466)

But the agent that brings about both these deaths is Fate, God the Father in His destructive phase. Paul's speeding of her death is simply one more attempt to interpose himself between his father and his mother. Even when she first takes sick, his attempt to save her is half-hearted. He knows she must die.

And finally, when he kisses her "passionately," and feels a "coldness against his mouth," he is brought to a last realization and choice. Like Baxter with Clara, he cannot "get at her." He must, as he does with Clara Dawes, return her to the father, or else, in a continuation to the end of the closed circle, follow his mother into death for the sake of her embrace. William, Paul's brother, of whom he was "unconsciously jealous," faced the same choice earlier in the novel. Preoccupied like Paul with death, he anticipates his mother and prepares a place in the grave for her. Like Gertrude's death, William's death <u>really</u> happened to Lawrence's brother Ernest; what is more important, as in Gertrude's death, is that William's death <u>must</u> happen in <u>Sons and Lovers</u> to justify William's part in the novel. William's is the way not taken, the negation of Paul's choice, the way consciously rejected by Paul at the end of the novel.

"Mater, my dear——" he began, with the whole force of his soul. Then he stopped. He would not say it. He would not admit that he wanted to die and have done. He would not own that life had beaten him, or that death had beaten him. (p. 482)

With the dying of Paul's mother, sexuality begins to equate itself for Paul more and more with actual death. Like Dostoevsky's epileptic seizures, whose psychogenic origin Freud found in a pantomime of his father's death, his orgasm in Clara's arms is a little death.

When he had her then, there was something in it that made her shrink away from him——something unnatural. She grew to dread him. He was so quiet, yet so strange. She was afraid of the man who was not there with her, whom she could feel behind this make-believe lover; something sinister, that filled her with horror . . . . He wanted her—he had her—and it made her feel as if death itself had her in its grip. (p. 453)

With Paul's last embrace of a living woman all three women are finally joined and identified as one, the mother. With her death the regressive, incestuous phantasies her life had fed, sicken and die with her. The pleasantly deathly consummation with Miriam, and the Nirvana-like "impersonality of passion" with Clara, resolve themselves in Paul's horror at the coldness of his mother's lips, a horror he inverts and feels in Clara, when he lies with her. Gertrude's death releases both Clara and Miriam from their functions as mother surrogates. They do not die for Paul; it is he, finally, who samples death, first pantomiming it in Clara's arms, and at the last, feeling it on his mother's mouth. Clara's horror of him is based on this: that Paul is trying to "die" on her.

But in the end Paul rejects death; <u>Sons and Lovers</u> is a comedy of the Oedipus complex. Nor is he Oedipus standing on the steps of his stricken house—he is journeying forth. Even the blindness is touched upon. Paul is described as turning "blindly." "He dared not meet his own eyes in the mirror. He never looked at himself." (p. 483) But the rejection of death is positive and absolute, and in its rejection, perverse as it

may seem, is the implicit rejection, valid in unconscious terms, of the women to whom he might have turned after the long night of his childhood was past. Fiction is invoked to dispel what in real life might have been a lingering, attenuated relationship, and to put in its place a more dramatic hic incipit vita nuova.

When Miriam, out of compassion, asks him to marry her, his reply shows the extent of his knowledge of what has happened. "But—you love me so much, you want to put me in your pocket. And I should die there, smother. (p. 483)" The unconscious formulation of the reply is rather an expression on Paul's part of his refusal to be tempted to crawl into another pocket, now that the one he has been in for so long has worn out and left him free.

But it is Paul's walk, on the last page of Sons and Lovers, toward the "faintly humming, glowing town," that sounds the note of positive choice. And the choice is, in psychoanalytic terms, a classically important one. In choosing the town Paul is accepting his father, an idealized image, like Hamlet's father, a "man," with all the expansive attributes the generic term allows. And turning his back upon his homeplace, he is rejecting, or at least modifying his acceptance of the mother. I think the process can be described as an inversion, a turning over to find a new center of gravity, long withheld. Whereas before Paul had, in his mother, loved an idealized image, capable of dangerous extensions into mother surrogates like Miriam and Clara, he had, in the father, hated (with that curious ambivalence already noted) what was, in effect, an identity, with a local habitation and a name. With Baxter Dawes, the process had begun to reverse itself. The father's identity begins to lose its historical boundaries in Walter Morel, while Gertrude is forced, by the exigencies of Paul's insistence upon becoming a man, into mere motherhood; and with her, surrogates lose their vitality and fall away.

From the very beginning the town stands in polar hostility to Gertrude, as the world of man, of deflowered countryside. It is to the town that Walter Morel and Jerry Purdy take their pub-crawling walk. The "Wakes" is a part of town life, the first sounds, for young William Morel, of the outside world: "the braying of a merry-go-round and the tooting of a horn." Gertrude hates them and Lawrence describes William, crucified by a choice, who "stood watching her, cut to the heart to let her go," and yet unable to leave the wakes. And for Paul in its turn, the town has exercised its attraction.

> From the train going home at night he used to watch the lights of the town, sprinkled thick on the hills, fusing together in a blaze of valleys. He felt rich in life and happy. (p. 134)

Like the "stars and sun, a few bright grains . . . holding each other in embrace," the town defies the dark, sometimes horrible one-time appeal of the maternal invitation to be still and passive. It is, like all the towers, citadels, mountain-tops, and Beautiful Cities of literature, the place to which one fights his way through the seas and jungles of world and mind.

In the end of Sons and Lovers there is implicit an acceptance of the father's values. Oedipus says, in what is the essential irony of the play,

> In doing right by Laius I protect myself, for whoever slew Laius might turn a hand against me.

Paul Morel is categorically rejecting all the elements of his Oedipal involvement. Having restored the Player King, Baxter Dawes, to his Player Queen, Clara, he enters the town, a man both driven and drawn across the threshold into manhood. In his identification with the bents and needs of the father he "protects" himself.

Daniel Weiss
Department of English
University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington

BOOK REVIEW

William Phillips, editor, Art and Psychoanalysis (New York: Criterion Books, Inc., 1957). Pp. xxiv + 552, including preface and introduction by the editor, and index. $8.50

The greatest value of Mr. Phillips' symposium consists in its assembling, within the covers of a single volume, of a substantial number of single papers and excerpts from larger works, many of which, as the editor justly remarks, have been "scattered through countless technical and academic journals and specialized publications, many of which are now unavailable." The way of an anthologist is a hard one, and no one's selection will meet with everyone's approval, neither from the viewpoint of what is included or what is left out. Yet the body of material here presented, in what is, after all, something of a pioneer work in the field, is substantial, if not equal, in merit; wide-ranging, if not encyclopedic, in research, and stimulating, if not always consistent, in viewpoint.

Mr. Phillips has introduced a somewhat startling dichotomy by including works, as he puts it, "by practicing analysts [and] by well-known authors." His choice has fallen on analysts most of whom are at least competent literary critics, and on "authors" who evidence far more than a mere smattering of psychoanalytic background. When both are at their best, there is no real need for this separation of the sheep from the goats, for Dr. Jones and Dr. Kris, to mention only two, are first-rate "authors" and critics, and Thomas Mann and Kenneth Burke are (literary) psychoanalysts whose skill in the science is wholly equal to their literary artistry.

The organization of the book follows the editor's dualism by falling into two sections, each of which is again subdivided into two parts. After his own introduction, for which he has, for some unaccountable reason, borrowed Professor Trilling's title, "Art and Neurosis," the editor first collects nine papers by psychoanalytic physicians and psychologists, each dealing with a particular work or author. The second section includes

papers with a similar interest, by writers whose field of specialization is criticism. The third and fourth parts follow the same general pattern insofar as writers are concerned, but the papers deal with general theory of psycho-literary criticism rather than with individual works and authors. Of the 27 pieces printed, 11 are excerpts or selections from other books and symposia, 5 are from American Imago, 4 from Partisan Review, 2 from The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, and 1 each from 4 other journals.

The chronological and geographical distribution is also interesting. No paper seems to be older than Freud's classic on "Dostoevsky and Parricide"(written in 1928), while the most recent, Mr. Lesser's study of Hawthorne and Sherwood Anderson, was published in 1957. The entire period of systematic psychoanalytic criticism, therefore, seems to cover little more than a quarter of a century. Representatives of the Vienna school, whether in Europe or in the United States, have written 9 of the papers; 13 are by native Americans; 3 are by Britons, whereas Germany and France are represented only by Thomas Mann and Mme. Bonaparte, respectively.

One outstanding characteristic of psychoanalytic criticism, the probing into ever-lower and more elusive layers of meaning, producing conclusions concerning a single author which would, in any other kind of investigation, be considered inconsistent with one another, is amply represented. For example, Mrs. Fraiberg has shown, with brilliant documentation, the absence of boundaries between reality and the dream-world in Kafka's writings. She concludes, however, by expressing some doubt as to the salutary influence of this psychotic process on Kafka's status as an artist.

> The disease which produced extraordinary dreams exerted its morbid influence on the creative process as well. The striving for synthesis, for integration and harmony which are the marks of a healthy ego and a healthy art are lacking in Kafka's life and in his writings. The conflict is weak in Kafka's stories because the ego is submissive; the unequal forces within the Kafka psyche create no tension within the reader, only a fraternal sadness, an identification between a writer and reader which takes place in the most solitary regions of the ego. ("Kafka and the Dream," p. 53)

Erich Fromm, on the other hand, has not the slightest doubt as to the artistic merits of Kafka's The Trial, which he considers "An outstanding example of a work of art written in symbolic language. ("Franz Kafka," p. 136)" Nor does he discern any lack of psychic "control" such as seems to disconcert Mrs. Fraiberg. For him The Trial is a conscious, or, at most, pre-conscious, symbolic presentation of the conflict between "freedom" and "authoritarianism," which is the basic tenet of his own particular version of psychoanalytic theory.

Yet there is no basic dynamic inconsistency between the two interpretations. Dr. Fromm admits that The Trial is a confused dream, K's dream, to be sure, but, by the same token, Kafka's dream.

> The priest [whose lengthy exhortation to K., demanding that he correctly evaluate the nature of the accusation against him is quoted by Fromm in full] made it quite clear that his attitude was the opposite of authoritarianism. . . . What is so confusing in the novel is the fact that it is never said that the moral law represented by the priest and the law represented by the court are different. . . . But this confusion in the story symbolizes the confusion in K's [and Kafka's?] heart. To him the two are one, and just because he is not able to distinguish between them, he remains caught in the battle with the authoritarian conscience and cannot understand himself. (p. 144)

"Le coeur a ses raisons que la raison ne connait pas." Mrs. Fraiberg believes that Kafka's confusion detracts from the artistic merit of his work; Dr. Fromm believes that, beneath that confusion, there is revealed an evaluation (conscious or unconscious) of the forces that make for synthesis and psychic balance. Yet the two interpretations complement and illuminate each other in such a way that the reader profits in greater measure than he suffers from the critical disagreement.

Dr. Fromm's point was made, it may be noted, by Professor Charles Allen in his paper on "Mark Twain and Conscience" in our last issue (VII, 2, 17-21). Yet, whatever may have been his psychic conflicts, no one would dream of suggesting that Mark Twain was psychotic, or unable to distinguish between dream and reality. Examples could be multiplied, but the reader would do well to find them for himself.

One or two shortcomings in this otherwise excellent work remain to be noted. First, it fails to meet the crying need in our field for a combination textbook and sourcebook such as might be used for the instruction of the student or younger scholar who wants to "find out how to go about this business of applying one discipline to another." The editor might well reply that he had no intention of compiling such a textbook. That job, however, still remains to be done. Second, it should also be pointed out that proof-reading for the work is sometimes quite slovenly, carrying over into the book manifest errors In the text of the original sources (e. g., at p. 164, in a translation of the lyrics of Offenbach's version of the Judgment of Paris, Aphrodite is said to have "gained the price"!)

L. F. M.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (XXVII)

Recently published and advertised:

Vernon W. Grant, The Psychology of Sexual Emotion (New York, Longmans, 1956) [The author, a psychologist, has made use of literary material from the writings of Proust, Santayana, Zola, H. G. Wells, Flaubert, and Stendhal.]

Recently published abroad and listed in the catalogues of European booksellers:

F. Lotte, Dictionnaire biographique des personnages fictifs de la "Comédie Humaine" (Paris, 1952/56) [Balzac]

Numéro spécial de la Revue des Sciences Humaines pour le Centenaire des Fleurs de Mal (Lille, 1957) [Baudelaire]

H. Weinreich, Das Ingenium Don Quijotes. Ein Beitrag zur literarischen Charkterkunde (Münster, 1956) [Cervantes]

M. Folman, Les impuissants de génie (Paris, 1957) [David Hume, D'Alembert, Amiel, J-J. Rousseau, Voltaire, Swift, etc.]

M. Marchand, Du Marquis de Sade à André Gide. Essai de critique psychopathologique et psychosexuelle (Oran, 1956)

J. Hamelin, Hommes de lettres inculpés (Paris, 1956) [Mérimée, Barbey d'Aurevilly, Maupassant, Flaubert, Baudelaire, Les Goncourt, Diderot]

N. Fürst, Die offenen Geheimtüren Franz Kafkas. Fünf Allegorien. (Heidelberg, 1956)

E. Aunos, Gérard de Nerval et ses énigmes (Paris, 1956)

F. Ström, L o k i. Ein mythologisches Problem (Göteborg, 1956)

J. B. Bamborough, The Little World of Man (London?, 1952) [Renaissance psychological theory as an aid to the understanding of Elizabethan literature.]

Mario Praz, The Hero in Eclipse in Victorian Fiction (trans. by Angus Davidson of La crisi dell'eroe nel romanzo vittoriano (London & New York, Oxford, 1956) [Little direct psycho-literary criticism, but, like all of Professor Praz's work, always stimulating.]

Patricia Thomson, The Victorian Heroine, a Changing Ideal. 1837-1873 (London & New York, Oxford, 1956)

Eric Partridge, Shakespeare's Bawdy (New York, Dutton, 1948; rev. edn., London?, 1955) [Designated as "a literary and psychological essay and comprehensive glossary," the work is far stronger in philology than in psychology.]

W. J. Weilgart, Shakespeare Psychognostic, Character Evolution and Transformation (?, 1952)

Submitted to your Editor with a Russian title and no further information:

B. Visheslavzev, The Ethics of the Enlightened Eros (Paris, YMCA Press, ?)

Submitted by Mr. Edward A. Hungerford:

'Mark Venafro' [pseudonym for Dr. Pizzat, clinical psychologist at Gannon College, Erie, Penna.], The Grand Chase (New York, Pageant Press, 1956) [Mr. Hungerford describes the book, which has 54 pages, as "a novelette,. . . really a short story between hard covers," in which the author attempts "to make use of the findings of psychoanalysis to explain the inadequacies of his 'hero,' an insurance salesman."]

From recent issues of periodicals received:

Heinrich [Enrique] Racker [Buenos Aires, Argentina], "Character and Desting," American Imago, 14, 2 (Summer, 1957), 89-110. [A lecture on the implications of psychoanalytic theory, delivered to the Friends of Psychoanalysis at the Argentine Psychoanalytic Association, in 1956.]

John Skinner, "James M. Barrie; or, The Boy Who Wouldn't Grow Up," Ibid.,111-141.

Martin Grotjahn, "The Defenses Against Creative Anxiety in the Life and Work of James Barrie," Ibid., 143-148. [A commentary on the Skinner article, supra.]

Burton S. Glick, "A Brief Analysis of a Short Story by Dylan Thomas," Ibid., 149-154. [The Followers]

Edmund Bergler, "Writers of Half Talent," Ibid., 154-164. [Saul Bellow, The Adventures of Augie March; Jessamyn West, The Witch Diggers; Marie Baumer, The Seeker and the Sought.]

Dorothy F. Zeligs, "Saul, The Tragic King," (Part II), Ibid., 165-189. [See Bibliography (XXVI); VII, 2, 27, where the author's name is misspelled Seligs.]

In the Skinner article, supra, reference is made to:

Martin Grotjahn, Beyond Laughter (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1957)

and

Marietta Karpe, "The Origins of Peter Pan," Psa. Rev., 43, 1 (Jan., 1956), 104-110.

* * * * * * *

The Shakespeare Newsletter, III, 3, (May, 1957, 21, reviews anonymously:

Ivor Brown, Dark Ladies (London, Collins, 1957) [Helen of Troy, Sappho, Cleopatra (including Shakespeare's), and also Shakespeare's 'Dark Lady'.]

* * * * * * *

Most appropriate, in part, in relation to the leading article in the present issue is:

James E. Miller, Jr., "Four Cosmic Poets," Univ. Kansas City Rev., XXIII, 4 (Summer, 1957), 312-320. [Walt Whitman, D. H. Lawrence, Hart Crane, Dylan Thomas]

Professor Miller accurately points out the probable origins of D. H. Lawrence's concept of the Unconscious:

When Jung formulated the theory [of the collective unconscious] explicitly in this century, he made it immediately available, directly or indirectly, to critics and poets. Lawrence's quarrel with Freud, written with poetic fervor if not with logical order, resulted in a formulation of a concept similar to Whitman's and Jung's. In Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious, he charged, 'The Freudian unconscious is the cellar in which the mind keeps its own bastard spawn.' The Lawrentian unconscious, on the other hand, is the unconscious pristine, primitive, elemental, unsullied by mind: this unconscious, asserts Lawrence, is the soul. Physically embodied in the solar plexus, this soul-unconscious lies 'beneath the burning influx of the navel,' physical, (even literal) symbol of the blood connection, the blood brotherhood of all mankind. Out of this pristine unconscious rises man's purest instincts and his gemuine poetry. (315,316)